

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS:

**MEDIA EMERGING**

Bureau of International Information Programs (IIP). U.S. Department of State. March 2006. 53 pages.

<http://usinfo.state.gov/journals/itgic/0306/ijge/ijge0306.pdf>

“Innovation in information technologies has thrust the world into an era of democratic media in which people have access to news and information unbound from traditional barriers of time and geography. Innovation gives rise to new media formats with new models for information distribution, consumption, and use. Traditional lines between the audience and media institutions are crossed as citizens gain access to platforms from which to express their own ideas and opinions, circumventing media corporations and governments, the long-standing gatekeepers of information. Established media institutions—newspapers and broadcasters—struggle to adapt to a new climate, just as media consumers seize their own territory in the information landscape to create a form of participatory journalism. Experts and pioneers in these changing technologies share their thoughts on the following pages, describing the innovations unfolding and offering a vision of what may lie ahead.”

**OFFSHORING IN SIX HUMAN SERVICES PROGRAMS: OFFSHORING OCCURS IN MOST STATES, PRIMARILY IN CUSTOMER SERVICE AND SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT**

Government Accountability Office (GAO). March 28, 2006. 45 pages.

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d06342.pdf>

“As states and the federal government have sought to streamline and improve administrative processes and take advantage of technological advances, both have outsourced certain functions to private firms. In some cases, these firms have used offshore resources to perform these functions. As a result, questions have been raised about the prevalence of offshoring in federal human services programs. In response to widespread congressional interest, we conducted work under the Comptroller General's authority to determine (1) the occurrence and nature of offshoring, (2) the benefits state agencies have achieved through offshoring and problems they have encountered, and (3) the actions, if any, states and the federal government have taken to limit offshoring and why.”

**INTERNET DOMAIN NAMES: BACKGROUND AND POLICY ISSUES**

Lennard G. Kruger. Congressional Research Service (CRS). March 3, 2006. 6 pages.

[http://www.ipmall.info/hosted\\_resources/crs/97-868\\_060320.pdf](http://www.ipmall.info/hosted_resources/crs/97-868_060320.pdf)

“The Administration issued a White Paper in June 1998 endorsing the creation of a new not-for-profit corporation of private sector Internet stakeholders to administer policy for the Internet name and address system. On November 25, 1998, the Department of Commerce (DOC) formally approved a new corporation, called the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between ICANN and DOC has been extended through September 2006. The 109th Congress maintains oversight on how the Department of Commerce manages and oversees ICANN's activities and policies. In response to proposals at the World Summit on the

Information Society (WSIS) for international control of the domain name system, the 109th Congress has expressed its support for maintaining U.S. control over ICANN.”

#### CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS:

##### TO CONSIDER H.R. \_\_\_\_, A COMMITTEE PRINT ON THE COMMUNICATIONS OPPORTUNITY, PROMOTION, AND ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2006

U.S. House of Representatives. Committee on Energy and Commerce. Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet. March 30, 2006.

<http://energycommerce.house.gov/108/Hearings/03302006hearing1823/hearing.htm>

“We stand on the threshold of a new age in communications. The 1996 Telecommunications Act served an important purpose, but technology and the markets have moved on. Previous attempts at increasing innovation, choice, and lower prices for consumers have focused on promoting competition within individual sectors of the communications industry. Time has shown, however, that the best way to promote competition and innovation is to encourage the deployment of advanced, facilities-based networks and competition across sectors.”

##### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY CHALLENGES AND THE FUTURE OF EMERGE2

U.S. House of Representatives. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on Government Management, Finance, and Accountability. March 29, 2006.

<http://reform.house.gov/GMFA/Hearings/EventSingle.aspx?EventID=41595>

“The success of eMerge2 has broad implications for the Department of Homeland Security, and the shared services model that is being employed will serve as an important test case for the government-wide Financial Management Line of Business initiative being proposed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Proper management of information technology – the eMerge2 program in particular – is a top priority for our Subcommittee, something we have followed closely for the past three years and something we will continue to focus on.”

##### LEAVE NO COMPUTER SYSTEM BEHIND: A REVIEW OF THE 2006 FEDERAL COMPUTER SECURITY SCORECARDS

U.S. House of Representatives. Committee on Government Reform. Full Committee. March 16, 2006.

<http://reform.house.gov/GovReform/Hearings/EventSingle.aspx?EventID=40364>

“Today, the Committee is releasing its federal computer security scorecards and will examine the status of agency compliance with the Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA). Due to the nature of our cyber infrastructure, an attack could originate anywhere at any time. We know that government systems are prime targets for hackers, terrorists, hostile foreign governments, and identity thieves. Malicious or unintended security threats come in varied forms: denial of service attacks, malware, worms and viruses, phishing scams, and software weaknesses, to name a few. Any of these threats can compromise our information systems. The results would be costly, disruptive, and erode public trust in government.”

##### WIRELESS ISSUES/SPECTRUM REFORM

U.S. Senate. Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. Full Committee. March 14, 2006.

<http://commerce.senate.gov/hearings/witnesslist.cfm?id=1709>

“Spectrum is one of our most important national resources. Americans increasingly rely on its use daily for family communications, work, education and entertainment. Moreover, wireless services are essential to the ability of first responders and the military to save lives and protect our homeland. In the past, Congress has responded to advances in technology and changes in the communications market by updating laws concerning the use and management of spectrum. Today we will hear whether Congress needs to address any particular wireless issue or address spectrum reform more.”

#### WALL STREET'S PERSPECTIVE ON TELECOMMUNICATIONS

U.S. Senate. Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. Full Committee. March 14, 2006.

<http://commerce.senate.gov/hearings/witnesslist.cfm?id=1712>

“In the four years after passage of the 1996 Telecommunications Act, hundreds of billions of dollars flowed into the communications sector, pushing stock prices up more than 300 percent. But then the bubble burst. While there were many reasons for the collapse, uncertainty stemming from the 1996 Act certainly played a part. As we listen to our panel today the Committee must consider how we can be sure that any legislation we approve is clear, competitively neutral, and readily implemented. We will also have to listen carefully to ensure that our legislation does not arbitrarily favor one industry segment over another, altering the flow of capital away from market forces and consumer choice.”

#### RURAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS

U.S. Senate. Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. Full Committee. March 7, 2006.

<http://commerce.senate.gov/hearings/witnesslist.cfm?id=1710>

“This hearing will address the issues, other than the Universal Service Fund, that relate to ensuring that all Americans, whether they live in urban, rural or insular areas, have access to basic and advanced communications at of comparable quality and reasonably comparable rates: the role of loans and grants by the Department of Agriculture, inter-carrier compensation (the system of a phone company paying another phone company to carry its traffic), the potential for the use of unlicensed spectrum to accelerate broadband deployment, and the challenges of improving communication service on tribal lands and in very rural areas.”

#### USF DISTRIBUTIONS

U.S. Senate. Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. Full Committee. March 2, 2006.

<http://commerce.senate.gov/hearings/witnesslist.cfm?id=1708>

“The changing face of communications demands that we reexamine the way Universal Funds are being spent and to what purpose. There have been many successful programs supported by USF, but there have also been some programs that could use some fine tuning. Today, we will listen to various parties in order to learn how the distribution of universal service funds might be improved in light of new realities in the marketplace and changes in technology.”

#### MARKUP RECORDS:

#### SENATE PANEL APPROVES BILL TO PROTECT TELEPHONE RECORDS (S. 2389)

Sarah Lai Stirland. TechnologyDaily. National Journal Group Inc. March 30, 2006.

[http://nationaljournal.com/members/markups/2006/03/mr\\_20060330\\_3.htm](http://nationaljournal.com/members/markups/2006/03/mr_20060330_3.htm)

“Senate Commerce Committee members on Thursday approved a bipartisan substitute plan to help protect the security of personal information that telephone and other communications companies collect about their customers.”

#### HOUSE COMMERCE BACKS STIFFER STANDARDS FOR DATA SECURITY (H.R. 4127)

Juliana Gruenwald. CongressDaily. National Journal Group Inc. March 29, 2006.

[http://nationaljournal.com/members/markups/2006/03/mr\\_20060329\\_5.htm](http://nationaljournal.com/members/markups/2006/03/mr_20060329_5.htm)

“The House Energy and Commerce Committee Wednesday approved a measure that would impose tougher standards on companies that buy and sell personal information in an effort to curb the growing problem of identity theft.”

#### BILL APPROVED TO EXEMPT INTERNET FROM CAMPAIGN FINANCE RULES (H.R. 1606)

Danielle Belopotosky. TechnologyDaily. National Journal Group Inc. March 9, 2006.

[http://nationaljournal.com/members/markups/2006/03/mr\\_20060309\\_1.htm](http://nationaljournal.com/members/markups/2006/03/mr_20060309_1.htm)

“The House Administration Committee on Thursday approved a bill that amend the Federal Election Campaign Act to exclude the Internet from the definition of public communication. The bill (H.R. 1606) sponsored by Rep. Jeb Hensarling, R-Texas, passed with unanimous consent by voice vote.”

#### COMMERCE PANEL VOTES TO BLOCK PHONE DATA BROKERS (H.R. 4943)

Michael Martinez. CongressDaily. National Journal Group Inc. March 8, 2006.

[http://nationaljournal.com/members/markups/2006/03/mr\\_20060308\\_2.htm](http://nationaljournal.com/members/markups/2006/03/mr_20060308_2.htm)

“The House Energy and Commerce Committee on Wednesday approved a bill to prohibit online brokers from fraudulently accessing consumer telephone records. The measure would make it illegal for online brokers to buy and sell individuals' monthly phone records.”

#### RESEARCH CENTER REPORTS:

##### ONLINE NEWS

Report. The Pew Internet & American Life Project. March 22, 2006. 27 pages.

[http://www.pewInternet.org/pdfs/PIP\\_News.and.Broadband.pdf](http://www.pewInternet.org/pdfs/PIP_News.and.Broadband.pdf)

“By the end of 2005, 50 million Americans got news online on a typical day, a sizable increase since 2002. Much of that growth has been fueled by the rise in home broadband connections over the last four years. For a group of “high-powered” online users – early adopters of home broadband who are the heaviest Internet users – the Internet is their primary news source on the average day.”

##### ONLINE DATING

Report. The Pew Internet & American Life Project. March 5, 2006. 35 pages.

[http://www.pewInternet.org/pdfs/PIP\\_Online\\_Dating.pdf](http://www.pewInternet.org/pdfs/PIP_Online_Dating.pdf)

“There is now relatively broad public contact with the online dating world. Some 31% of American adults say they know someone who has used a dating website and 15% of American adults – about 30 million people – say they know someone who has been in a long-term relationship or married someone he or she met online. At the same time, while online dating is becoming more commonplace, there are still concerns in the wider public about the dangers of posting personal information on dating sites and about the honesty of those who pursue online dating.”

## THINK TANK OPINION AND ANALYSIS:

### CIRCUMVENTING COMPETITION: THE PERVERSE CONSEQUENCES OF THE DIGITAL MILLENNIUM COPYRIGHT ACT

Timothy B. Lee. The Cato Institute. Policy Analysis No. 564. March 21, 2006. 28 pages.

<http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa564.pdf>

“When Congress passed the Digital Millennium Copyright Act in 1998, it banned any devices that “circumvent” digital rights management (DRM) technologies, which control access to copyrighted content. The result has been a legal regime that reduces options and competition in how consumers enjoy media and entertainment. Today, the copyright industry is exerting increasing control over playback devices, cable media offerings, and even Internet streaming. Some firms have used the DMCA to thwart competition by preventing research and reverse engineering. Others have brought the weight of criminal sanctions to bear against critics, competitors, and researchers.”

### ECONOMISTS’ STATEMENT ON U.S. BROADBAND POLICY

AEI-Brookings Joint Center for Regulatory Studies. Related Publication 06-06. March 2006. 4 pages.

<http://www.aei.brookings.org/admin/authorpdfs/page.php?id=1252>

“In this statement, a group of economists assembled by the AEI-Brookings Joint Center makes the following two recommendations to improve the competitive provision of broadband services. First, Congress should eliminate local franchising regulations, which serve as a barrier to new entry. Second, Congress and the Federal Communications Commission should make more spectrum available to private parties and allow them to use it as they see fit or trade their licenses in the market, so that spectrum will go to its highest-valued uses.”

### NEUTERING THE NET

Thomas W. Hazlett. AEI-Brookings Joint Center for Regulatory Studies. Policy Matters 06-08. March 2006.

<http://www.aei.brookings.org/policy/page.php?id=249>

“The legendary Vint Cerf, co-creator of the Internet Protocol (IP) standard in the 1970s, is pleading for “network neutrality.” Cerf, now Google’s chief Internet evangelist, argues for government regulation to ensure that broadband subscribers can use any network application or device, without extra fees. The fear is that cable modem and digital subscriber line (DSL) networks will forge their own content deals, and then “click block” rival websites. Broadband network executives, however, say that they may start charging content suppliers – say, sticking Google with a 10 cents per search fee – to reach their customers.”

### THE MISPLACED DEBATE OVER "NET NEUTRALITY"

Robert W. Hahn and Scott Wallsten. AEI-Brookings Joint Center for Regulatory Studies. Policy Matters 06-06. March 2006.

<http://www.aei.brookings.org/policy/page.php?id=248>

“Politicians, businesses, techies, and consumer groups used to agree on one government policy: “Hands off the Internet!” Now some Internet service providers like Verizon, AT&T, and Comcast want to upend the rules of the game. They want to stick it to both content providers like CNN and to regular consumers—instead of just charging end users as they do now. Critics fret that this could be the end of

the Internet as we know it. We think it may just be the beginning of a better Internet if the government puts on its thinking cap and weighs policy choices carefully.”

#### NET NEUTRALITY: VIDEO DIALTONE REDUX?

Solveig Singleton. The Progress & Freedom Foundation. Progress Snapshot 2.10. March 2006. 3 pages.

<http://www.pff.org/issues-pubs/ps/2006/ps2.10netneutrality.pdf>

“One puzzle in the net neutrality debate has been the willingness of should-knowbetter tech companies to embrace this form of regulation. They seem reluctant to recognize that as democratic as "neutral" sounds, that such a regime is likely to quickly devolve into a tangle of price and service regulation navigable only by an elite. To someone starting on the telco side, this outlook is unthinkable naive. But it should be equally unthinkable to Net old-timers, who understand the complex history of this "network of networks," and its occasional but important departures from perfect egalitarianism.”